



STORMWATER WORK GROUP

Wednesday, September 21, 2016, from 9:00 am to 12:05 pm
USGS, 934 Broadway, Tacoma WA, 98402

Final Summary

OF THE MEETING'S KEY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND AGREEMENTS

a list of acronyms is provided at the end of the document

ATTENDEES:

Work Group members and alternates present, and the organizations and caucuses they represent:

Cami Apfelbeck (Bainbridge Island), Local Governments, and the Work Group's Chair; **Jess Archer** (ECY EAP), State Agencies; **Abby Barnes** (WDNR), State Agencies, and the Work Group's Vice Chair; **Kevin Burrell** (Seattle), Local Governments; **Jay Davis** (USFWS), Federal Agencies; **Leska Fore** (PSP), State Agencies; **Dick Gersib** (WSDOT), State Agencies; **Todd Hunsdorfer** (King Co), Local Governments; **Shana Joy** (WSSC), Agriculture; **Chris Konrad** (USGS), Federal Agencies; **Jennifer Lanksbury** (WDFW), State Agencies; **Ben Parrish** (Covington), Local Governments; **Kit Paulsen** (Bellevue), Local Governments; **Andy Rheame** (Redmond), Local Governments.

Others in attendance: **Brad Archbold** (WSDOT), **Angela Gallardo** (Kitsap Co), **Amy Georgeson** (Tumwater), **Andy James** (UW-Tacoma), **Ani Jayakaran** (WSU-Puyallup), **Rick Moore** (GeoEngineers), **Sarah Norberg** (Tacoma), **Rob Plotnikoff** (TetraTech), **Debby Sargent** (ECY EAP), **Connie Sullivan** (Puget Soundkeeper Alliance).

Work Group staff: **Karen Dinicola** (ECY WQP), SWG Project Manager; and **Brandi Lubliner** (ECY WQP), RSMP Coordinator.

WORK GROUP LEARNS ABOUT NEARSHORE BACTERIA DATA COMPILATION AND ANALYSIS

Early in the implementation phase of the RSMP, the SWG decided not to include monthly bacteria sampling in urban nearshore areas as part of the status and trends monitoring component during this permit cycle, but instead to use some of the funds to compile and assess data gathered by other programs and make recommendations for future sampling. Debby Sargent was, until recently, the BEACH Program Manager for the Washington State Departments of Health and Ecology. She was selected by the PRO-C to do this project. Debby is near completion of this project which will result in a Technical Memo. Her PowerPoint presentation to the work group will be posted with this meeting summary.

The project scope of work focused on identifying what fecal coliform, *Enterococcus*, and *E. coli* bacteria data are available for 2010-15 in the Puget Sound nearshore adjacent to urban growth areas. Debby found good spatial coverage overall, with most of the data in west central Puget Sound and a data gap for the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Most of the data are for fecal coliform. There are lots of non-detects, with much of the data variation likely attributed to the purpose of the sampling, *i.e.*, samples collected during or following storm events near tributary streams have the highest concentrations.

Jim Simmonds of King County is the technical liaison for this project; he and Leska Fore will both review the draft final technical memo which is due at the end of November. Following up on this project, we as a work group need to identify more specific questions for further data analysis and recommendations for long term regional monitoring and trends assessments. Debby can make some suggestions for us in her memo.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES PROGRESS TOWARD IDENTIFYING A SECOND ROUND OF EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES

In July, the RSMP Coordinator received 22 Letters of Interest (LOIs) for possible effectiveness studies. The one project that was not aligned with the purpose of this RSMP component retracted their proposal, so the group was left with 21 LOIs to review. Three different SWG Effectiveness Subgroup members reviewed each of the proposals and then the subgroup discussed all of the LOIs. The purpose of the subgroup's review at this stage was not to screen out or rank the proposals, but rather to provide feedback to the study proponents to help them develop full proposals that are more likely to succeed. The subgroup also did some combining of study ideas so that proponents of similar projects can work together on full proposals.

Following today's discussion, Brandi Lubliner will send the subgroup's feedback to each project proponent.

For the next round, we will ask for a rough budget estimate at the LOI stage. At the end of the effectiveness studies selection workshop next spring, we will ask participants what kinds of studies they want that they are not seeing represented in the proposals under consideration. As a work group, we will decide whether highly ranked studies that cannot be funded during this cycle will be first in line for funding in the next permit cycle.

WORK GROUP DISCUSSES EVALUATION OF ECOLOGY AS RSMP SERVICE PROVIDER

Over the summer, the PRO-Committee completed a “report card” on Ecology’s performance as RSMP Administrator. The PRO-C also completed an evaluation of its own performance in its oversight role. Both of these evaluations are specified in the PRO-C charter. The work group appreciated the PRO-C’s work and the format they developed to present both of the evaluations.

Ecology appreciates getting this report card and wants to be sure work group members and other stakeholders have a full picture of the internal Ecology workload associated with implementing the RSMP. To this end, Jess Archer shared three specific areas that are not captured in the report card.

- Revenue collection involves invoicing work that is different from project invoicing. Ecology staff prepared an invoicing and accounting system for managing permittees’ payment. They mail out invoices, track the revenue, and follow up with permittees who haven’t paid on time. They also generate the receipts that go into PARIS (Ecology’s permit reporting system). There is an additional annual workload in updating permittee contacts.
- Cash flow management also includes budget planning and management activities beyond ensuring that revenues are not overspent. Administrating this large budget includes advance projections and getting management approval. For Ecology, as a state agency, this includes getting buyoff from OFM and the legislature.
- Communication of RSMP findings will be an ongoing workload for the RSMP Coordinator even with AWC involved in the support role. (Work group members suggested that additional spokespersons for the RSMP might be identified beyond the RSMP Coordinator hired by Ecology.)

Work group members agreed that the PRO-C should continue to conduct these evaluations of Ecology as RSMP service provider on a regular basis. It is helpful to have the information available to all interested parties about what is working well and where improvements can be made. Work group members suggested that the evaluations occur at the middle of, and about six months before the end of, each permit cycle. Work group members asked the PRO-C to discuss both the frequency and any additional “report card” evaluation topics at its next meeting and to bring recommendations back to the work group at our next meeting in November.

Meanwhile, Brandi is getting the real-time feedback and oversight she needs from the PRO-C to keep the projects moving and producing results the SWG is looking for from the RSMP.

WORK GROUP UPDATED ON RSMP IMPLEMENTATION AND OVERSIGHT

RSMP Coordinator Brandi Lubliner and PRO-Committee chair Ben Parrish provided a detailed update on RSMP activities, contracting decisions, and upcoming projects. In addition to the details listed in the meeting agenda:

- The AWC contract for communication support is not yet signed but we hope that will happen soon. If possible, the advisory committee for this project should include representatives of each of the “persona” groups of Public Works Directors, elected officials, stormwater managers, and field technicians. The RSMP should be featured at the municipal stormwater conference being put on by the Washington Stormwater Center each year. The RSMP symposium can be timed with this conference during years that it is held in western Washington. Since “MuniCon 2017” is in Yakima we will hold a one day symposium here this coming spring to share RSMP findings.
- The business inspection source control effectiveness study is having a hard time getting data. A renewed request for these data will be included in the next SWG Reporter. Future studies will use an RSMP cover letter to explain the request for data. The work group will have ongoing conversations about how to do this type of study and how to make the most of the permittees’ investment in these highly ranked studies. One idea is a “data elf” role to help permittees compile and explain their data. Overall we want to avoid inefficient production of new data.
- Only a couple of the RSMP mussel cage status and trends sites were not used as nearshore sediment sampling sites. Connecting these data will be a future study topic.
- Work group members who want to be included in the PSEMP Freshwater Workgroup’s detailed discussions of the RSMP Puget Lowland Stream Data analysis and findings should contact [Leska Fore](#) to be added to that list.

WORK GROUP UPDATED ON PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLETING AN AGRICULTURAL RUNOFF MONITORING STRATEGY

Shana Joy of WSCC is both staff and chair of the SWG Agricultural Runoff Subgroup. The subgroup brought four prior sets of recommendations for agricultural monitoring priorities to the work group for approval. They are working on an implementation plan for conducting the monitoring. Securing funding will be a significant challenge, but the subgroup is making progress on a plan centered on leveraging national programs. In preparation for discussing a completed draft implementation plan at our November meeting, we will hear a presentation by NRCS on the “Discovery Farms” and “Conservation Effects Assessment Project” programs. Work group members want to ensure that other state agencies (Ecology, Agriculture) are aware of and support this monitoring concept. Shana’s PowerPoint presentation to the work group will be posted along with this meeting summary.

WORK GROUP HEARS ABOUT THE RSMP MUSSEL SAMPLING EFFORT

Jennifer Lanksbury’s PowerPoint presentation to the work group will be posted along with this meeting summary. The sampling was a success with a tremendous volunteer effort supporting it. Findings will be presented next spring.

WORK GROUP UPDATED ON STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSIONS ABOUT UPCOMING PERMIT REISSUANCE

An *ad hoc* group of permittees and other stakeholders (WEC, PSA, Futurewise) has been meeting to discuss recommendations for other parts of the municipal stormwater permits. Ecology has been attending. The group is open to others and all of the information is posted on a website hosted by the Washington Stormwater Center. The purpose is building relationships and having dialogue toward a common goal. Subtopic leads developing proposals for monitoring (outside S8 and focused on G9 and Appendix 9), Phase 1&2 permit comparisons, LID, structural controls, and watershed planning. Contact [Todd Hunsdorfer](#) if you’d like more information about this process. The group’s next meeting is September 29.

WORK GROUP UPDATED ON NEP-FUNDED OUTFALL MAPPING PROJECT

Abby Barnes presented the mapped outfall data supplied by permittees. The data will be posted on WDNR’s map finder; there is no “final report” for this project. There is no consistency in the data, and the spatial variation in the maps reflects the multiple interpretations of the term stormwater “outfall” versus system “asset.” The online map display will include contextual explanation. Work group members expressed that it is a good idea to capture the lessons learned from this project and discuss how the results might influence how permittees manage their data. Abby’s PowerPoint presentation to the work group will be posted along with this meeting summary.

GET INVOLVED IN THE SWG’S WORK PLAN UPDATES!

At our next meeting we will begin to discuss various subgroup’s proposals for updating our 2016-2017 work plan for 2017-2018. Dick Gersib volunteered to help Karen gather information and ideas about our work group’s next steps.

FUTURE MEETING DATES AND PROPOSED DISCUSSION TOPICS

At all of our meetings, we will:

- Hear feedback from the RSMP Coordinator and PRO-Committee on RSMP implementation,
- Continue to discuss recommendations for RSMP implementation and oversight outside the permit structure,
- Hear from our subgroups about the status of implementing our current work plan,
- Hear updates from the PSEMP Steering Committee and other workgroups, and Action Agenda coordination, and
- Determine messages and timing for the next SWG Reporter issue.

At our next meeting on Wednesday, November 9, 2016 from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm at the USGS Office in Tacoma, we will also:

- Learn about key programs that could be leveraged to implement an agricultural runoff monitoring strategy,
- Hear initial findings of the analysis of the RSMP data collected in small Puget Lowland streams in 2015, and
- Consider updates to our work plan for 2017-2018.

Work group meetings in 2017 are scheduled on January 18, March 15, June 7, September 13, and November 15.

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS MEETING SUMMARY:

AWC – Association of Washington Cities
BEACH – Beach Environmental Assessment, Communication, and Health
BMP – Best Management Practice
ECY EAP – Washington Dept. of Ecology’s Environmental Assessment Program
ECY WQP – Washington Dept. of Ecology’s Water Quality Program
G9 – Municipal Stormwater Permit General Condition G9
NEP – National Estuary Program (of USEPA)
NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service
PRO-C or PRO-Committee – Pooled Resources Oversight Committee
PSA – Puget Soundkeeper Alliance
PSEMP – Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Program
PSP – Puget Sound Partnership
RSMP – Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program
SWG – Stormwater Work Group
S8 – Municipal Stormwater Permit Special Condition S8
USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS – U.S. Geological Survey
UW – University of Washington
WDNR – Washington Dept. of Natural Resources
WEC – Washington Environmental Council
WSCC – Washington State Conservation Commission
WSDOT – Washington Dept. of Transportation
WSU – Washington State University